



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SW  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,903	12/07/2001	Edward P. Daniels JR.	F-418	7206
919	7590	11/10/2003	EXAMINER	
PITNEY BOWES INC. 35 WATERVIEW DRIVE P.O. BOX 3000 MSC 26-22 SHELTON, CT 06484-8000			RODRIGUEZ, JOSEPH C	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3653		
DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/008,903	DANIELS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Joseph C Rodriguez	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
**THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                                   |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of claims 1-3 in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 4-6 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

***Inventorship***

In view of the papers filed 4/16/02, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by adding Joseph D. Mallozzi as an inventor.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of the file jacket and PTO PALM data to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

Art Unit: 3653

***Specification***

***Claim Objections***

The claims are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 1, line 1 should read "A system" and claim 2, line 1 should read "A method". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the apparatus" (ln. 2). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the apparatus" (ln. 2). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the system" (para. b and c). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the sender's addressee information" (para. g). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Art Unit: 3653

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al. ("Allen") (US '783).

Allen teaches a system (Fig. 7-11) comprising a sorting apparatus (118), a video coding station (88) configured to allow operator input (126), a return mail work station (92), an inserting apparatus (112), and a data file (102), wherein the system provides update information to the return mail workstation after viewing the video image and then prepares the outgoing mailpiece (i.e., forwarded mail) using said updated information (col. 9, ln. 13 et seq.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haruki et al. ("Haruki") (US '252) in view of Anderson, Jr. et al. ("Anderson") (US '051).

Haruki (Fig. 1-6, Abstract, col. 4, ln. 20 et seq.) teaches all that is claimed except for expressly teaching updating a data file for an inserting apparatus preparing outgoing mailpieces. Anderson, however, teaches a mail inserter that obtains information from a

Art Unit: 3653

network linked central server that constantly updates client data used in producing outgoing mailings (col. 3, ln. 55- col. 4, ln. 42). Moreover, Anderson expressly teaches that the central server system can be used by both mail sorters and mail inserters to more efficiently manage mailpiece information (col. 2, ln. 1-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Haruki by linking the mail sorter to a mail inserter with a central server to more efficiently handle the mail related information.

### ***Conclusion***

Any references not explicitly discussed above but made of record are considered relevant to the prosecution of the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph C Rodriguez whose telephone number is 703-308-8342. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F during normal business hours (9 am – 6 pm, EST).

The examiner's **Personal fax number** is 703-746-3678.

The **Official** fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326.

The **UnOfficial** fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-306-2571 or 703-308-6552.

Art Unit: 3653

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **703-308-1113**.

\*\*\*

November 5, 2003

  
DONALD P. WALSH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600